

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the courtesy extended in an interview with Joseph Fox on December 4, 2003. In the interview, the examiner and applicants agreed that the Laity reference (U.S.P.N. 5, 940,275) does not read on claim 7, and that the rejection was improper. More specifically, it was agreed that the upper and lower cover panels 44 and 46 of Laity do not display information in response to a driving signal. Further, applicants and the examiner agreed that no screen or display panel was disclosed by Laity.

Claim 7 stands rejected under § 102 on the basis of Laity. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons given in the interview.

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Philips et al. Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In the interview, the examiner indicated that the keypad 70 shown in Fig. 2A of Philips et al. corresponds to the display panel of claim 7. The examiner also indicated that the visual display device 108 shown in Fig. 3 of Philips et al. corresponds to the panel-shaped module component of claim 7. The visual display device 108 may have an individual light emitting diode, an LCD or an LED display. See column 11, lines 33 to 37. However, the visual display device 108 is an individual display device separate from the keypad 70. In contrast, the panel-shaped module component of claim 7 is not an individual display device separate from the display panel, but rather is superposed on the display panel. For this reason, applicants traverse the examiner's correspondence between the panel-shaped module component and the visual display device 108.

Furthermore, the visual display device 108 may be incorporated in the telephone 10 to extend through an opening 109, shown in Figs. 1 and 2A, so as to be perceived. The opening 109 is

disposed on a first portion 18(1) of the outer cover 18. See column 11, lines 37 to 42. The first portion 18(1) includes an opening 72. The opening 72 is positioned on the cover 18 to be substantially aligned with the position of the keypad 70 when the telephone 10 is assembled. See column 8, lines 5 to 11. Therefore, the visual display device 108 and the keypad 70 would be aligned along a surface of the outer cover 18. On the other hand, the panel-shaped module component of claim 7 is superposed on the rear surface of the display panel. One example of this structure is shown in Fig. 13 of the present specification. Philips et al. fail to disclose or even suggest the panel-shaped module component of claim 7.

The examiner indicated that the frame member 12 of Philips et al. corresponds to the bezel of claim 7. See page 3, lines 1 and 2 of the outstanding office action. “Bezel” is a kind of grooved ring or rim holding panel members together, for example. The frame member 12 is a housing or an enclosure of the telephone 10. The frame member 12 cannot be included in the “bezel”. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 7 and dependent claim 15, is respectfully requested.

New claim 16 is similar to claim 7, but places the panel-shaped module component in opposing relation to the rear surface of the display panel. New claim 16 is allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 7. Allowance is requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

January 5, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
F:\Data\WP60\2500\65689\Amend B.doc